REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-6 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4 and 6 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim 4 was objected to because of informality. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion and have amended claim 4 accordingly. Other minor amendments were made to claims 4 and 6 to better conform to U.S. patent practice.

Claims 1 and 3-6 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly based on a disclosure that is not enabling. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Action contends that "[t]he lock pin and trunk region of the lock cancel button, critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure." The Action then goes on to say "[i]n the arguments filed 11/22/06, the applicants refer to figure 4 of the instant application to explain operation of the coil spring," but after repeating some of the details from the 11/22/06 argument, the Action states "[t]he specification does not reasonably provide description or enablement of an embodiment wherein the locking of the sliding section is effected by just the coil spring, as recited in claim 1, such that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to make and/or use the claimed invention without undue experimentation." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 in fact recites the limitation "wherein the sliding section is configured to be locked inwardly toward a first body section by a coil spring." Thus, the Action mischaracterizes the plain language of the claim: the locking of the sliding section does not have to be effected by just the coil spring. That is not what is claimed and that is not what is disclosed in abundant detail in the specification. Reading the claims in conjunction with applicants' specification, for example at pages 12-13 and Fig. 4, no person skilled in the art would have any difficulty making and/or using the claimed invention with minimal experimentation, if any. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Okada U.S. Patent No. 6,023,816 in view of Feid U.S. Patent No. 2,009,254, or, in the alternative, obvious over Okada in view of Feid and further in view of Lee U.S. Patent 6,314,058. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections with respect to the claims, as amended.

Claim 1 was amended to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein one end of the belt member is fixedly connected to one end of the winding length adjusting unit and the other end of the belt member is adapted to pass through an opening in the other end of the winding length adjusting unit, and wherein the opening in the other end of the winding length adjusting unit is configured to allow the belt member length to be fixed or adjusted upon passing through the opening." Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in applicants' specification on pages 10-11 and in Figs. 1-3.

This same combination is neither disclosed nor suggested by Okada, Feid or Lee, viewed alone or in combination. For example, the end of Okada's band 12 not connected to cover 2 by spring-loaded pin 3 is connected to connecting plate 13 by a pin 14. This end of Okada's band does not pass through an opening and cannot be adjusted. Feid does not overcome this deficiency because Feid is directed to a talon-type bracelet comprising opposite arcuately-shaped arms hingedly connected to the sides of the watch and resiliently operated to clasp around the wrist of the wearer. Similarly, Lee discloses nothing more than an ordinary watchband where the ends closest to the watch are fixedly connected to the watch and no adjustment at those ends is possible.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. This logic also disposes of the rejection of claims 3-6, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants solicit early action in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **163852020900**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2007

By: _____

Brian N. Fletcher
Registration No. 51,683

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 400
Mclean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 760-7796
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777